

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In re N.C., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

N.C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A154790

(Contra Costa County  
Super. Ct. No. J1800608)

On June 8, 2018, the Contra Costa County District Attorney filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition alleging that the 16-year-old appellant had committed acts constituting the felony offense of assault with force likely to produce great bodily injury against his father on June 6, 2018 (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(4)) (count one); the misdemeanor offense of battery against his mother on May 12, 2018 (Pen. Code, §§ 242; 243, subd. (a)) (count two); and the misdemeanor offense of resisting, obstructing, or delaying a peace officer on May 11, 2018 (Pen. Code, § 148, subd. (a)(1)) (count three). The offenses stemmed from incidents of physical disputes between appellant and his parents that arose from appellant's failure to follow home rules and his "addiction" to playing video games. During a probation department interview, appellant admitted playing video games three to four hours per day on weekdays and six to eight hours per day on weekends.

At a juvenile pretrial conference hearing on June 15, 2018 (Hon. George Spanos), the court extensively questioned appellant regarding his signed waiver of rights and agreement to enter no contest pleas to the misdemeanor offense of battery (count two) and the felony offense of false imprisonment committed against his father on June 6, 2018 (Pen. Code, § 236) (added as count four). The parties stipulated to a factual basis for the pleas based on two specified police reports. The court accepted appellant's pleas, found he had agreed to the pleas freely, voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and found there was a factual basis for the pleas. The offenses alleged in counts one and three of the petition were dismissed. The court also secured appellant's understanding and agreement that a different judge would adjudicate at disposition.

At the disposition hearing on June 29, 2018 (Hon. Leslie G. Landau), the court declared appellant a ward of the court with no termination date and a review was set for June 28, 2019. Appellant was released to his mother's custody and he was ordered to "Home Supervision" for 60 days (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 628.1), and thereafter he was to comply with standard conditions of probation under the supervision of the probation department (*id.*, § 727, subd. (a)(2)). Following an extensive discussion of appellant's circumstances, the court imposed specific probationary conditions including a prohibition on playing video games on any electronic device unless related to educational purposes, an order to mandatory family counseling, and an order for appellant to write a 750-word essay on the effect of video games on the adolescent brain. The court also imposed an electronic device search clause that, in pertinent part, required appellant to submit any cell phone or electronic device under his control to a search reasonably likely to reveal whether he is complying with the terms of his probation. The court explained that the search provision was important because electronic devices could be manipulated to allow appellant to coordinate with other video game players to circumvent the probationary term prohibiting video gaming.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief raising no issues and asks us to independently review the record under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). As required by *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 124, we affirmatively note that appellant has been

informed of his right to file a supplemental brief and he has not filed such a brief. Based on our independent examination of the entire record, we agree with appellate counsel that there are no issues warranting further briefing. The record does not reflect any legal error or abuse of discretion in the plea or disposition proceedings.

**DISPOSITION**

The dispositional order is affirmed.

---

PETROU, J.

We concur:

---

SIGGINS, P.J.

---

JENKINS, J.